

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By the present remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the June 5, 2007 Office Action and allowance of the present application at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Summary of the Official Office Action

The office action has rejected applicant's claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by DHCP for IPv6 (hereinafter DHCP).

Additionally, the office action has also rejected Applicant's claims 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Coley et al. (US 5,826,014, hereinafter Coley).

Moreover, the office action rejected Applicant's claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DHCP as applied to claim 1 and further in view of RFC 2373.

Also, the office action rejected Applicant's claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coley as applied to claim 10 and further in view of RFC 2373.

Lastly, the office action rejected Applicant's claims 4-6 and 7-9 as the computer-executable process and apparatus of method claims 1-3 under the same reasoning and rejected claims 13-15 and 16-18 as the computer-

executable process and apparatus of method claims 10-12 under the same reasoning.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is allowable over the cited art, and an indication of allowability of the present application is therefore respectfully requested.

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In re claims 1 and 3

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by DHCP.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, . . . "judging whether a network address acquired from a received signal corresponds to identification data" acquired from the received signal, and "sending a message preventing a device from using the network address corresponding to the identification data."

Applicant respectfully submits that DHCP fails to disclose at least the above-noted features of the present invention.

Reviewing DHCP, it discloses that a status code in a Reply message tells a client either that its request succeeded, or else the reason for the failure (Section 3.4). DHCP provides no teaching or suggestion of judging whether a network address acquired from a received signal corresponds to identification data acquired from the received signal, and sending a message preventing a

device from using the network address corresponding to the identification data.

Because DHCP lacks at least the above-noted features of the present invention, Applicant submits that DHCP fails to disclose each and every feature recited in amended claim 1, and the Office Action has failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Furthermore, Applicant submits claim 3 is allowable at least for the reason that it depends from allowable base claim 1 and recites additional features that further define the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

In re claims 10 and 12

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Coley.

As amended, independent claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, . . . “judging whether the network address acquired from the received signal corresponds to an identifier which is acquired from the received signal and specific to the device” and “limiting transfer of the signal in accordance with whether the network address corresponds to the identifier specific to the device.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Coley fails to disclose at least the above-noted features of the present invention.

Reviewing Coley, it discloses a comparison of a source address with a list of authorized or unauthorized addresses maintained by a proxy agent (page 5, figure 4A, step 414). Coley provides no teaching or suggestion of judging whether the network address acquired from a received signal corresponds to an identifier which is acquired from the received signal and specific to a device and limiting transfer of a signal in accordance with whether the network address corresponds to the identifier specific to the device.

Because Coley lacks at least the above-noted features of the present invention, Applicant submits that Coley fails to disclose each and every feature recited in amended claim 10, and the Office Action has failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Furthermore, Applicant submits claim 12 is allowable at least for the reason that it depends from allowable base claim 10 and recites additional features that further define the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claims 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In re claim 2

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DHCP as applied to claim 1 and further in

view of RFC 2373. As mentioned above, DHCP fails to teach, suggest, or show all the elements of amended independent claim 1. Additionally, RFC 2373 also fails to show, suggest, or teach the features not shown by DHCP.

Thus, DHCP, and RFC 2373, separately or in combination (which Applicants do not admit are combinable) fails to show, suggest, or teach all the features of claim 2, which depends on claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In re claim 11

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coley as applied to claim 10 and further in view of RFC 2373. As mentioned above, Coley fails to teach, suggest, or show all the elements of amended independent claim 10. Additionally, RFC 2373 also fails to show, suggest, or teach the features not shown by Coley.

Thus, Coley, and RFC 2373, separately or in combination (which Applicants do not admit are combinable) fails to show, suggest, or teach all the features of claim 11, which depends on claim 10.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In re claims 4-6 and 7-9

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 4-6 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being the computer-executable process and apparatus of method claims 1-3 under the same reasoning as claims 1-3. As mentioned above, DHCP fails to teach, suggest, or show all the elements of amended independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claims 4-6 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration of each dependent claim, on its own merits, is respectfully requested.

In re claims 13-15 and 16-18

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 13-15 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being the computer-executable process and apparatus of method claims 10-12 under the same reasoning as claims 10-12. As mentioned above, Coley fails to teach, suggest, or show all the elements of amended independent claim 10.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claims 13-15 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration of each dependent claim, on its own merits, is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at (949) 932-3329.

Respectfully submitted,

9/5/07

/Sivon Kalminov/

Date

Sivon Kalminov, Reg. No. 40,042
Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731
Fax: (949) 932-3560